

## **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated July 17, 2009, the Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and on the following remarks.

Claims 1, 4-7, 17-20, 23, and 25-34 are pending in this application.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Office indicates that claims 17-20 and 23-34 would be allowable if certain § 112 rejections are overcome. The Assignee believes the § 112 rejections are cured, and Examiner Parry is thanked for the indication of allowability.

### **Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Office rejected claims 17-20 and 23-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Independent claims 17 and 26 have been amended, so the Office is respectfully requested to re-examine these claims in their current presentation.

### **Rejection of Claims 1 & 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

The Office rejected claims 1 and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,889,385 to Rakib, *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0192053 to Sheppard, *et al.*, further in view of U.S. Patent 6,839,902 to Hirota, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2008/0184306 to Ellis, *et al.*, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,233,389 to Barton, *et al.*

Claims 1 and 4-7, however, cannot be obvious over the proposed combination of *Rakib*, *Sheppard*, *Hirota*, *Ellis*, and *Barton*. These claims recite, or incorporate, features that are not

taught or suggested by *Rakib, Sheppard, Hirota, Ellis, and Barton*. Independent claim 1, for example, recites “*a plurality of tuners and demodulators with each tuner and demodulator having an output connected to the system data bus and connected to an analog-to-digital converter*” (emphasis added). Support may be found at least in FIG. 6.

These features are not taught or suggested by *Rakib, Sheppard, Hirota, Ellis, and Barton*. The proposed combination of *Rakib, Sheppard, Hirota, Ellis, and Barton* teaches a single digital tuner 780 connected to a “QSPK DEMOD” 820, with three other tuners 700, 702, and 704 connected to an “A/D MATRIX” 730 (see *Rakib’s* FIG. 7A). Only the tuner 700 is connected to *Rakib’s* reference numeral 756, which the Office interprets as equivalent to the claimed “*system data bus*.” While *Rakib’s* reference numeral 756 is a bus, *Rakib* explains that bus 756 sends data from CPU 728 to the tuner 700. See U.S. Patent 6,889,385 to *Rakib, et al.* at column 33, lines 24-25 and lines 32-35. The proposed combination of *Rakib, Sheppard, Hirota, Ellis, and Barton*, then, does not teach or suggest “*a plurality of tuners and demodulators with each tuner and demodulator having an output connected to the system data bus and connected to an analog-to-digital converter*” (emphasis added). One of ordinary skill in the art would not think that independent claim 1 is obvious.

Claims 1 and 4-7, then, are not obvious over *Rakib, Sheppard, Hirota, Ellis, and Barton*. Independent claim 1 recites features that are not disclosed or suggested by *Rakib, Sheppard, Hirota, Ellis, and Barton*. The dependent claims incorporate these same features and recite additional features. Claims 1 and 4-7, then, cannot be obvious, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

---

If any issues remain outstanding, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned at (919) 469-2629 or [scott@scottzimmerman.com](mailto:scott@scottzimmerman.com).

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott P. Zimmerman". The signature is stylized with large, sweeping loops and a prominent "Z" at the end.

Scott P. Zimmerman  
Attorney for the Assignee  
Reg. No. 41,390